arXiv:hep-th/0601118v4 11 Jul 2006

Elements of Fedosov geometry in Lagrangian BRST Quantization

A.A. Reshetnyak*
Tomsk State Pedagogical University, 634041 Tomsk, Russia

Abstract

A Lagrangian formulation of the BRST quantization of generic gauge theories in general irreducible non-Abelian hypergauges is proposed on the basis of the multilevel Batalin–Tyutin formalism and a special BV–BFV dual description of a reducible gauge model on the symplectic supermanifold $\mathcal{M}_0$ locally parameterized by the antifields for Lagrangian multipliers and the fields of the BV method. The quantization rules are based on a set of nilpotent anticommuting operators $\Delta^{\mathcal{M}}, V^{\mathcal{M}}, U^{\mathcal{M}}$ defined through both odd and even symplectic structures on a supersymplectic manifold $\mathcal{M}$ locally representable as an odd (co)tangent bundle over $\mathcal{M}_0$ provided by the choice of a flat Fedosov connection and a non-symplectic metric on $\mathcal{M}_0$ compatible with it. The generating functional of Green's functions is constructed in general coordinates on $\mathcal{M}$ with the help of contracting homotopy operators with respect to $V^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $U^{\mathcal{M}}$. We prove the gauge independence of the S-matrix and derive the Ward identity.

1. Introduction The conventional form of the Lagrangian [1] ([2]) and Hamiltonian [3] ([4, 5]) quantization schemes for general gauge theories realizing the BRST (BRSTantiBRST) symmetry (preserving locality and global symmetries) was developed about 15–20 years ago and is sufficient, as a whole, for a perturbative quantization of gauge models formulated on the basis of the variational principle. Despite this fact, it is still of interest to investigate a number of additional problems related, first of all, to geometrically covariant formulations of quantization procedures reflecting global and invariant properties of the manifold of field variables in specific models. This activity was initiated by the Lagrangian multilevel formalism [6] as well as by the Hamiltonian [7] coordinate-free formalism based on the construction of Weyl symbols and by the (modified) triplectic [8] ([9]) BRSTantiBRST scheme. On the other hand, it is closely related, through the notion of supertime $\chi = (t, \theta)$, with the problem of an equitable representation of the dynamics and BRST transformations of a given model within the superfield Lagrangian [10, 11, 12, 13] and Hamiltonian [14, 15, 16] quantization schemes.

A solution to the first series of problems with respect to general aspects of quantization is the construction of a $\star$-product by Kontsevich [17] within the deformation quantization of the algebra of functions on an arbitrary Poisson manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{P}}$ for which in [18] one applies a topological Poisson σ-model defined on $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{P}}$, whose field-antifield spectrum, following the AKSZ approach [19], in an $N = 2$ superfield (non-spacetime) formulation coincides with the corresponding set of fields and antifields of the BV method. One of such problems is the construction of a deformation quantization for dynamical systems with second-class constraints and symplectic manifolds [20] on the basis of the BFV–BRST [3] conversion methods [21], as well as for non(Lagrangian)Hamiltonian gauge theories [22] such as higher-spin gauge fields [23], in which one essentially uses a symmetric connection compatible with the symplectic structure, i.e., the Fedosov connection [24, 25].

While the Lagrangian BRSTantiBRST (superfield) quantization [26] ([27]) defined in general coordinates preserves the tensor character of compatible differential operations, i.e., extended antibrackets, odd operators $(\Delta^a, \mathcal{V}^a, \mathcal{U}^a), a = 1, 2$, only in the case of a *flat* Fedosov connection on the supermanifold $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_0$ in Darboux coordinates parameterized by the fields ϕ^A of the BV method and by the corresponding antifields $\overline{\phi}_A$, being the sources to the commutator of BRSTantiBRST transformations [2], the construction of Lagrangian BRST quantization in irreducible [6] and reducible (first introduced in [11]) non-Abelian hypergauges[1] in fact does not use[2] the concept of Fedosov connection. It has been shown by the local superfield BRST quantization [11, 12] that using merely the ingredients of the *first-level* formalism, in view of a special presence of Lagrangian multipliers λ^a for hypergauges $G_a(\Gamma)$, is insufficient for an introduction of a covariant derivative on $\mathcal{N}$. For this purpose, one must use not only λ^a but also the antifields λ^*_a which appear in the *second-level* formalism [6].

---

*E-mail addresses: A-Reshetnyak@yandex.ru, reshet@tspu.edu.ru

[1] The study of the influence of *reducibility* and *non-Abelian* properties of hypergauges on specific gauge models in quantum calculations is an important part of the work [28].

[2] Except for the case of a special connection F_p, $F_p(\Gamma) = \delta\{\ln(\rho[\Gamma])\}/\delta\Gamma^p$ [6], expressed in terms of a density functional $\rho[\Gamma]$ on the "first-level" supermanifold $\mathcal{N} = \{\Gamma^p\}$ defining in Darboux coordinates, $\Gamma^p = (\phi^A, \phi^*_A)$, the (anti)fields (ϕ^*_A) ϕ^A of the BV method.

The principal goals of this report are the following:

1. Description of the gauge algebra of a reducible gauge model by means of a *special BV–BFV duality* between odd $\mathcal{N}_{\min}$ and even $\mathcal{M}_{0\min}$ symplectic manifolds[3] underlying the quantization procedure and intersecting with respect to the manifold parameterized by the minimal-sector fields of the BV method.
2. Investigation of a supersymplectic structure on the quantization manifold $\mathcal{M}$[4] compatible with the requirements of anticommutation for the set of nilpotent operators $\Delta^{\mathcal{M}}, V^{\mathcal{M}}, U^{\mathcal{M}}$.
3. Formulation of quantization rules for gauge models in general coordinates on $\mathcal{M}$ with an essential use of operators $\mathcal{V}^*$,$\mathcal{U}^*$ (constructed in terms of both even and odd Poisson brackets) whose difference $(\mathcal{U}^* - \mathcal{V}^*)$ is a contracting homotopy with respect to $V^{\mathcal{M}}$ for the operator $N^{\mathcal{M}}$ nondegenerate on nonconstant functions on $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$.

2. Special BV-BFV dual description of a gauge model Let us recall that an L-stage reducible gauge theory based on the variational principle with classical fields A^i, $i = 1, ..., n = n_+ + n_-$ (in condensed notation and with Grassmann parity ε: $\varepsilon(A^i) = \varepsilon_i$) is defined by a classical bosonic action $\mathcal{S}_0(A)$: $C^\infty\left(\mathcal{M}_{\rm cl}\right) \to \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{M}_{\rm cl} = \{A^i\}$, invariant with respect to gauge transformations, $\delta A^i = R^i_{\alpha_0}(A)\xi^{\alpha_0}$, $\alpha_0 = 1, ..., m_0 = m_{0+} + m_{0-}$, $\varepsilon(\xi^{\alpha_0}) = \varepsilon_{\alpha_0}$,

$$\mathcal{S}_{0,i}\, R^i_{\alpha_0}(A) = 0,\ \text{for}\ \mathrm{rank}\, \|\mathcal{S}_{0,ij}\,(A)\|_{\mathcal{S}_{0,k}=0} = \overline{n} - \overline{m}_{-1} \equiv (n_+, n_-) - (m_{-1+}, m_{-1-}), \mathcal{S}_{0,i} \equiv \delta\mathcal{S}_0/\delta A^i, \quad (1)$$

by means of reducibility relations in condensed notations for $s = 1, ..., L$,

$$\begin{gathered} Z^{\alpha_{s-2}}_{\alpha_{s-1}}(A) Z^{\alpha_{s-1}}_{\alpha_s}(A) = \mathcal{S}_{0,j}\, L^{\alpha_{s-2}j}_{\alpha_s}(A)\,,\ \alpha_s = 1, ..., m_s = m_{s+} + m_{s-}, \\ \overline{m}_{s-1} > \sum\nolimits_{k=0}^{s-1} (-1)^k \overline{m}_{s-k-2} = \mathrm{rank}\left\|Z^{\alpha_{s-2}}_{\alpha_{s-1}}\right\|_{\mathcal{S}_{0,k}=0},\ \overline{m}_L = \sum\nolimits_{k=0}^{L} (-1)^k \overline{m}_{L-k-1} = \mathrm{rank}\left\|Z^{\alpha_{L-1}}_{\alpha_L}\right\|_{\mathcal{S}_{0,k}=0}, \\ \varepsilon(Z^{\alpha_s}_{\alpha_{s+1}}) = \varepsilon_{\alpha_s} + \varepsilon_{\alpha_{s+1}},\ Z^{\alpha_{-1}}_{\alpha_0} \equiv R^i_{\alpha_0},\ L^{\alpha_{-1}j}_{\alpha_1} \equiv K^{ij}_{\alpha_1} = -(-1)^{(\varepsilon_i+1)(\varepsilon_j+1)} K^{ji}_{\alpha_1}. \quad (2) \end{gathered}$$

Definitions (1), (2), partially determining the first-order structure relations and functions of the gauge algebra, are encoded, due to the corresponding Koszul–Tate complex resolution [29] extended (following the BV method) to an odd Hamiltonian formulation of the model in $\Pi T^*\mathcal{M}_{\min} = \{\Gamma^{p_k}_k = (\phi^{A_k}, \phi^*_{A_k}) | \phi^{A_k} = (A^i, C^{\alpha_s}, s = 0, ..., L), A_k = 1, ..., n_k = n + \sum_{r=0}^{L} m_r; k = \min\}$[5], by means of a bosonic functional and a classical master-equation in the minimal sector [1]

$$\begin{gathered} S_k(\Gamma_k) = \mathcal{S}_0(A) + \sum\nolimits_{s=0}^{L} \left(C^*_{\alpha_{s-1}} Z^{\alpha_{s-1}}_{\alpha_s}(A) + o(\phi^*_k)\right) C^{\alpha_s} + o(C^{\alpha_s}),\ \ (\varepsilon, \mathrm{gh}) S_k = \vec{0}, \\ (S_k, S_k)^k = \frac{\delta_r S_k}{\delta \Gamma^p_k} \omega^{pq}_k(\Gamma_k) \frac{\delta_l S_k}{\delta \Gamma^q_k} = 0,\ \ \|\omega^{pq}_k\| = \mathrm{antidiag}\left(-\mathbf{1}_{n_k}, \mathbf{1}_{n_k}\right). \quad (3) \end{gathered}$$

The quantum action $S^\psi(\Gamma_k, \hbar)$ of the BV method (in what follows, $k = \mathrm{ext}$) is constructed, firstly, by an extension of $S_{\min}$ with the help of the pyramids of ghosts and Nakanishi–Lautrup fields up to $S_k(\Gamma_k, \hbar)$ defined on $\Pi T^*\mathcal{M}_k = \{\Gamma^{p_k}_k = (\phi^{A_k}, \phi^*_{A_k}) | \phi^{A_k} = (\phi^{A_{\min}}, C^{\alpha_s}_{s'}, B^{\alpha_s}_{s'}, s' = 0, ..., s, s = 0, ..., L), A_k = 1, ..., n_k = n + \sum_{r=0}^{L} (2r+3) m_r; k = \mathrm{ext}\}$, and, secondly, by imposing an Abelian hypergauge corresponding to a phase anticanonical transformation in $\Pi T^*\mathcal{M}_k$ of an $\hbar$-deformed $S_k(\Gamma_k, \hbar)$

$$S_k(\Gamma_k) = S_{\min} + \sum\nolimits_{s=0}^{L} \sum\nolimits_{s'=0}^{s} C^*_{s'\alpha_s} B^{\alpha_s}_{s'};\ S^\psi(\Gamma_k, \hbar) = \exp\left[\left(\psi(\phi_k,\ \ )^k\right)\right] S_k(\Gamma_k, \hbar). \quad (4)$$

The functionals $[S_k, S^\psi](\Gamma_k, \hbar)$ obey a quantum master-equation and provide its proper solutions in terms of a nilpotent operator Δ^k constructed via a nondegenerate antibracket in $\Pi T^*\mathcal{M}_k$, as well as a trivial density function $\rho(\Gamma_k)$, $\rho = 1$, and $\omega^k_{pq}(\Gamma_k)$, $\|\omega^k_{pq}\| = \operatorname{antidiag}(\mathbf{1}_{n_k}, -\mathbf{1}_{n_k})$, $\omega^{pq}_k \omega^k_{qr} = \delta^p_r$,

---

[3] In what follows, we often omit the prefix "super" in the term "supermanifold".

[4] $\mathcal{M}$ locally represents a vector bundle over the manifold $\mathcal{M}_0$, $\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}_0$, so that $\mathcal{M}_0 \supset \mathcal{M}_{0\min}; \mathcal{N} \supset \mathcal{N}_{\min}; \mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$.

[5] The coordinates on $\Pi T^*\mathcal{M}_k$ possess the following distribution of Grassmann parity and ghost number [1]: $(\varepsilon, \mathrm{gh}) C^{\alpha_s} = (\varepsilon_{\alpha_s} + s + 1, s + 1), \mathrm{gh}(A^i) = 0, \varepsilon(\phi^{A_k}) = \varepsilon_{A_k}, (\varepsilon, \mathrm{gh}) \phi^*_{A_k} = (\varepsilon_{A_k} + 1, -1 - \mathrm{gh}(\phi^{A_k}))$.

$$\Delta^k \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar} E(\Gamma_k, \hbar)\right\} = 0,\ E \in \{S^\psi, S_k\},\ \Delta^k = \frac{1}{2}(-1)^{\varepsilon(\Gamma^q)} \rho^{-1} \omega^k_{qp} \left(\Gamma^p_k, \rho\left(\Gamma^q_k,\ \cdot\ \right)^k\right)^k . \tag{5}$$

In the second-level formalism [6], the presence of antifields λ^*_a to Lagrangian multipliers λ^a introducing the non-Abelian first-level hypergauges $G_a(\Gamma_k)$ to the exponent of the path integral $Z^{(1)}$[6] permits one to construct a special BV–BFV dual description of a model on the cotangent bundle $T^*\mathcal{M}_k = \{x^{p_k}_k = (\phi^{A_k}, \lambda^*_{A_k}), (\varepsilon, \mathrm{gh})\lambda^*_{A_k} = (\varepsilon_{A_k}, -2 - \mathrm{gh}(\phi^{A_k}))\}$ in the case of gauge theories of rank 1 [in general, on a sub-bundle $\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{aux}} \to \mathcal{M}_k$ of the bundle $\Pi T^*(T^*\mathcal{M}_k)$, $\Pi T^*(T^*\mathcal{M}_k) \supset \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{aux}} \supset T^*\mathcal{M}_k$ with a fiber over ϕ^{A_k}: $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{aux}}}_{\phi^A} = \{(\lambda^*_{A_k}, \phi^*_{A_k})\}$] by means of a *BRST-like charge.* This object is nilpotent for $\hbar = 0$ with respect to an even Poisson bracket defined on $C^\infty(T^*\mathcal{M}_k)$ $[C^\infty(\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{aux}})]$ and determines a formal dynamical system subject to first-class constraints by means of an algorithm different from that of [12, 15, 19]. To this end, let us consider a functional $\Omega_k(x_k, \phi^*_k) \in C^\infty(\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{aux}})$, $(\varepsilon, \mathrm{gh})\Omega_k = (1, -1)$, constructed from nilpotent fermionic quantities V^*_k, $\eta = \mathrm{const}$, $\mathrm{gh}(\eta) = -1$,

$$\Omega_k = V^*_k S_k(\Gamma_k, \hbar) + \eta \mathcal{S}_0(A) \equiv \lambda^*_{A_k} \frac{\delta_l S_k}{\delta \phi^*_{A_k}} + \eta \mathcal{S}_0 \tag{6}$$

as well as with use of an odd operator Δ^k_{d} dual to Δ^k and an even Poisson bracket $\{\ ,\ \}^k$ nondegenerate on $T^*\mathcal{M}_k$

$$\begin{gathered}\Delta^k_{\mathrm{d}} = \eta(-1)^{\varepsilon_{A_k}} \frac{\delta_l}{\delta\phi^{A_k}} \frac{\delta_l}{\delta\lambda^*_{A_k}},\ \{\ ,\ \}^k = \frac{\delta_r}{\delta x^p_k} \omega^{pq}_{\mathrm{d};k}(x_k) \frac{\delta_l}{\delta x^q_k}, \\ \varepsilon(\omega^{pq}_{\mathrm{d};k}) = \varepsilon(\omega^{pq}_k) + 1 = \varepsilon(x^p_k) + \varepsilon(x^q_k), \left\|\omega^{pq}_{\mathrm{d};k}\right\| = \operatorname{antidiag}(-\mathbf{1}_{n_k}, \mathbf{1}_{n_k}) .\end{gathered} \tag{7}$$

The operator V^*_k, being a contracting homotopy with respect to an nilpotent operator, V_k, $V_k = \phi^*_{A_k} \frac{\delta_l}{\delta\lambda^*_{A_k}}$, for an operator N_{V_k}, $N_{V_k} = [V_k, V^*_k]_+$, nondegenerate on the fibers $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{aux}}}_{\phi^A}$, satisfies, along with V_k, the properties

$$\begin{gathered}[V^*_k, \Delta^k]_+ = 0,\ V^*_k (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})^k = (V^*_k \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})^k - (-1)^{\varepsilon(\mathcal{F})} (\mathcal{F}, V^*_k \mathcal{G})^k , \\ [V_k, \Delta^k_{\mathrm{d}}]_+ = 0,\ V_k \{F, G\}^k = \{V_k F, G\}^k + (-1)^{\varepsilon(F)} \{F, V_k G\}^k .\text{[7]}\end{gathered} \tag{8}$$

The gauge algebra relations (1)–(3) and eqs. (4), (5) are equivalently described with the help of a correspondence among Poisson brackets of opposite parities for arbitrary functionals $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{t}}(\Gamma_k) \in C^\infty(\Pi T^*\mathcal{M}_k)$ and $F_{\mathrm{t}}(x_k, \phi^*_k) = [V^*_k \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{t}}(\Gamma_k) + \eta \mathcal{F}_{0\mathrm{t}}(\phi_k)]$, $\mathcal{F}_{0\mathrm{t}} \equiv \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{t}}|_{\mathcal{M}_k} \in \ker N_{V_k}$, for $\mathrm{t} = 1, 2$,

$$V_k\{F_1, F_2\}^k = N_{V_k}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)^k,\ \Delta^k_{\mathrm{d}} F_{\mathrm{t}} = \eta \Delta^k \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{t}};\ \{\Omega_{\min}, \Omega_{\min}\}^{\min} = 0, \tag{9}$$

$$1/2\, \{E_k(x_k, \phi^*_k), E_k(x_k, \phi^*_k)\}^k = i\hbar \Delta^k_{\mathrm{d}} E_k,\ E_k \in \left\{\Omega_k, \Omega^\psi\right\}, \Omega^\psi = \exp\left[\{F,\ \}\right] \Omega_k, \tag{10}$$

with a *gauge boson* $F(\phi_k)$, $F(\phi_k) = \eta\psi(\phi_k)$. From eqs. (9), (10), it follows that for rank-1 gauge theories (i.e., for $S_k = \mathcal{S}_0 + \phi^*_{A_k} H^{A_k}(\phi_k) \Leftrightarrow V^*_k S_k \in T^*\mathcal{M}_k, k = \mathrm{ext}$) to whose class one can always reduce an initial gauge model (modulo the conservation of locality and covariance) the BFV–BRST quantities dual to S_k, S^ψ are defined only on $C^\infty(T^*\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{ext}})$[8].

---

[6] In the case of a fiber bundle $\Pi T^*\mathcal{M}_k$: $a = A_k, G_a = G_{A_k}(\Gamma_k) = \left(\phi^*_{A_k} - \delta\psi/\delta\phi^{A_k}\right)$ and $[\lambda^a, \lambda^*_a] = \left[\lambda^{A_k}, \lambda^*_{A_k}\right]$ that corresponds to the construction of $S^\psi(\Gamma_k, \hbar)$ in (4).

[7] As a whole, on $\Pi T^*(T^*\mathcal{M}_k) = \left\{(x^p_k, (\phi^*_{A_k}, \lambda^{A_k}))\right\}$, there exist nilpotent operators $(U_k, U^*_k, \Pi\Delta^k_{\mathrm{d}}) = \left(\lambda^{A_k} \frac{\delta_l}{\delta\phi^{A_k}}, \phi^{A_k} \frac{\delta_l}{\delta\lambda^{A_k}}, \eta(-1)^{\varepsilon_{A_k}+1} \frac{\delta_l}{\delta\lambda^{A_k}} \frac{\delta_l}{\delta\phi^*_{A_k}}\right)$ analogous to $\left(V_k, V^*_k, \Delta^k_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$, which, firstly, obey the same properties as in (8) for the corresponding exchange $\left(V_k, V^*_k, \Delta^k_{\mathrm{d}}\right) \leftrightarrow \left(U_k, U^*_k, \Pi\Delta^k_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$, secondly, mutually anticommute, $[E, D]_+ = 0$, $E \in \left\{V_k, V^*_k, \Delta^k_{\mathrm{d}}\right\}, D \in \left\{U_k, U^*_k, \Pi\Delta^k_{\mathrm{d}}\right\}$, and, thirdly, yield the operator $N_{U_k} = [U_k, U^*_k]_+$ nondegenerate on fibers $\mathcal{F}^{\Pi T^*(T^*\mathcal{M}_k)}_{x^p_k}$.

[8] A more natural construction of the above BV–BFV duality is realized by a θ-local superfield model with superfields $\Lambda^*_A(\theta)$, $\Lambda^*_A(\theta) = \lambda^*_A + \theta\phi^*_A$, instead of $\Phi^*_A(\theta)$, $\Phi^*_A(\theta) = \phi^*_A - \theta J_A$, used in [10, 11, 12].

3. Poisson brackets and triplectic-like algebra of $\Delta^{\mathcal{M}}, V^{\mathcal{M}}$ ($\mathcal{V}^{*}$,$\mathcal{U}^{*}$) Leaving aside the realization of an initial gauge model in the BV method, let us consider a Poisson supermanifold $(\mathcal{M}_0, \{\cdot,\cdot\}_0)\,, \mathcal{M}_0 = \{x^p\}$, $\dim \mathcal{M}_0 = \dim T^{*}\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{ext}}$[9] with an even Poisson bracket defined by a tensor (bivector) field $\omega^{pq}(x)$ over $\mathcal{M}_0$, $\omega^{pq} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_p\varepsilon_q}\omega^{qp}$, $(\varepsilon, \mathrm{gh})\omega^{pq} = \bigl(\varepsilon_p + \varepsilon_q, \mathrm{gh}(x^p) + \mathrm{gh}(x^q) + 2\bigr), \varepsilon(x^p) = \varepsilon_p$, satisfying the Jacobi identity

$$\omega^{qp}\left(\delta_l \omega^{rs}/\delta x^p\right)(-1)^{\varepsilon_q\varepsilon_s} + \mathrm{cycle}(q,r,s) = 0, \tag{11}$$

and also with a covariant derivative ∇_p on $\mathcal{M}_0$ transforming $\mathcal{M}_0$ into a Poisson supermanifold with a symmetric connection $\Gamma^p{}_{rs}(x)$, $\Gamma^p{}_{rs} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_r\varepsilon_s}\Gamma^p{}_{sr}$ (for a nondegenerate $\omega^{pq}(x)$, i.e., for the existence of the quantities $\omega_{pq}(x), \omega_{pq} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_p\varepsilon_q}\omega_{qp}, \omega^{pq}\omega_{qr}(-1)^{\varepsilon_q} = \delta^p_r$, $\mathcal{M}_0$ transforms into a Fedosov supermanifold [30])

$$\overleftarrow{\nabla}_r\omega^{pq} = 1/2\left[(\delta_r\omega^{pq})/(\delta x^r) + 2\omega^{ps}\Gamma^q{}_{rs}(-1)^{\varepsilon_s(\varepsilon_q+1)}\right] - (-1)^{\varepsilon_p\varepsilon_q}(p \leftrightarrow q) = 0. \tag{12}$$

Let us introduce a manifold $\mathcal{M} = \{(x^p, \eta_p)\}$ locally realized by an odd (co)tangent bundle over $\mathcal{M}_0$, $\mathcal{M} = \Pi T^{*}\mathcal{M}_0 \simeq \Pi T\mathcal{M}_0$, whose fibers are parameterized by covariantly constant vectors η_p, $(\varepsilon, \mathrm{gh})\eta_p = (\varepsilon_p + 1, -1 - \mathrm{gh}(x^p))$, being antifields to x^p [for $\mathcal{M}_0 = T^{*}\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{ext}}$, $(x^p;\eta_p) = (\phi^{A_k}, \lambda^{*}_{A_k}; \phi^{*}_{A_k}, \lambda^{A_k})$]. We next define a scalar functional $T(x,\eta)$ with respect to an (extended to $\mathcal{M}$) covariant derivative $\overleftarrow{\nabla}{}^{\mathcal{M}}_p$

$$T = \frac{1}{2}\eta_p\omega^{pq}(x)\eta_q,\ (\varepsilon, \mathrm{gh})T = (0,0),\ \overleftarrow{\nabla}{}^{\mathcal{M}}_p T = \frac{\delta_r T}{\delta x^p} + \frac{\delta_r T}{\delta\eta_q}\eta_r\Gamma^r{}_{qp} = 0, \tag{13}$$

in view of eqs. (12) and the relations $\overleftarrow{\nabla}{}^{\mathcal{M}}_p\,\eta_q = 0$. Supplementing $\mathcal{M}_0$ by a bosonic scalar density $\rho(x)$ is sufficient to determine the covariant operations characteristic for the supersymplectic manifold $\mathcal{M}$: an antibracket $(\cdot,\cdot)^{\mathcal{M}}$ and operators $\Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$, $V^{\mathcal{M}}$,

$$(\cdot,\cdot)^{\mathcal{M}} = \left(\overleftarrow{\nabla}{}^{\mathcal{M}}_p\cdot\right)\frac{\delta_l\cdot}{\delta\eta_p} - \left(\frac{\delta_r\cdot}{\delta\eta_p}\right)\overrightarrow{\nabla}{}^{\mathcal{M}}_p\cdot,\ \Delta^{\mathcal{M}} = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_p}\frac{\delta_r}{\delta\eta_p}\left(\overleftarrow{\nabla}{}^{\mathcal{M}}_p + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\delta_r\rho}{\delta x^p}\right), \tag{14}$$

$$V^{\mathcal{M}} = (T,\ )^{\mathcal{M}} = -\eta_p\omega^{pq}\overrightarrow{\nabla}{}^{\mathcal{M}}_q\,, \tag{15}$$

which (by an explicit verification for scalars on $\mathcal{M}$) can be shown to obey the relations of a *triplectic-like algebra* [26], $[E_1, E_2]_{+}$ =0 for $E_1, E_2 \in \{\Delta^{\mathcal{M}},\ V^{\mathcal{M}}\}$, compatible with the Leibniz rule of differentiating an antibracket similar to (8) by any E_1, E_2 only in the case of a *flat Poisson manifold* $\mathcal{M}_0$[10]. An obvious representation of $\mathcal{M}$ as $\Pi T\mathcal{M}_0$ permits one to lift the nondegenerate Poisson structure $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_0$ to a flat Fedosov manifold $(\mathcal{M}, \{\cdot,\cdot\})$ by the relation

$$\{\cdot,\cdot\} = \left(\overleftarrow{\nabla}{}^{\mathcal{M}}_p\cdot\right)\omega^{pq}\left(\overrightarrow{\nabla}{}^{\mathcal{M}}_q\cdot\right) + \alpha\frac{\delta_r\cdot}{\delta\eta_p}\omega_{pq}\frac{\delta_l\cdot}{\delta\eta_q},\ \alpha = \mathrm{const} \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{16}$$

The covariant definition of an nilpotent operator $U^{\mathcal{M}}$ satisfying the relations $[E_1, E_2]_{+}$ =0 for $E_1, E_2 \in \{\Delta^{\mathcal{M}},\ V^{\mathcal{M}},\ U^{\mathcal{M}}\}$ as in Sec. 2 (see footnote 7), in comparison with the realization [26] of the modified triplectic algebra, is impossible in terms of an anti-Hamiltonian vector field but is ensured by equipping $\mathcal{M}_0$ with an additional Riemann-type nondegenerate even structure $g_{pq}(x), g_{pq}$=$(-1)^{\varepsilon_p\varepsilon_q}g_{qp}$, in the form

$$U^{\mathcal{M}} = -\eta_p\omega^{ps}g_{st}\omega^{tq}(-1)^{\varepsilon_s}\overrightarrow{\nabla}{}^{\mathcal{M}}_q,\ \left(U^{\mathcal{M}}\right)^2 = 0 \Leftrightarrow \overrightarrow{\nabla}_q g_{ps} = 0. \tag{17}$$

Since the action of ∇ is undetermined as a tensor operation on the coordinates x^p, an explicit definition of an operator $V^{*\mathcal{M}}$ ($U^{*\mathcal{M}}$) of contracting homotopy w.r.t. $V^{\mathcal{M}}$ ($U^{\mathcal{M}}$) for a nondegenerate (on non-constant functions from $C^{\infty}(\mathcal{M})$) operator $N^{\mathcal{M}}$ ($N^{\mathcal{M}}_U$) is possible only for a symplectic $\mathcal{M}_0$, i.e., for $\Gamma^p{}_{rs}$=0. To this end, we, first, consider the adjoint action of a fermionic functional $\Omega_T(x,\eta)$, $\Omega_T = -\eta_p x^p$, w.r.t. the non-tensor bracket (16), and, second, to single out operators $\mathcal{V}^{*}$,$\mathcal{U}^{*}$ analogous to V^{*}_k, U^{*}_k in Sec. 2 define an operator $U^{*\mathcal{M}}$ via the non-tensor bracket (14) with bosonic $T^{*}(x,\eta)$, $T^{*} = -(1/2)x^p g_{pq}(x)x^q(-1)^{\varepsilon_q}$,

$$V^{\mathcal{M}} + \alpha V^{*\mathcal{M}} = \{\Omega_T,\ \} = -\eta_p\left(\omega^{pq}\frac{\delta_l}{\delta x^q} - (-1)^{\varepsilon_r(\varepsilon_q+1)}\frac{\delta_r\omega^{pq}}{\delta x^r}\eta_q\frac{\delta_l}{\delta\eta_r}\right) + \alpha\left(x^p\omega_{pr} - \right. \tag{18}$$

$$\left.(-1)^{\varepsilon_r(\varepsilon_q+1)}\alpha^{-1}\eta_p\frac{\delta_r\omega^{pq}}{\delta x^r}\eta_q\right)\frac{\delta_l}{\delta\eta_r},\quad U^{*\mathcal{M}} = (T^{*},\ )^{\mathcal{M}} = -x^p\left(g_{pq}(x) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\delta_l g_{ps}}{\delta x^q}x^s(-1)^{\varepsilon_q\varepsilon_s}\right)\frac{\delta_l}{\delta\eta_q},$$

---

[9] In the infinite-dimensional case, the concept of dimension has to be clarified. For the vector bundle $\mathcal{M}_0 \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ with the base superspace-time $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$, it is formally understood that $\dim \mathcal{M}_0$ is the dimension of the fiber $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{M}_0}_p$ over an arbitrary $p \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$.

[10] That is, for a vanishing curvature tensor $R^q{}_{prs}(x)$ defined for arbitrary vectors $T^r(x)$ as follows: $[\overleftarrow{\nabla}_q, \overleftarrow{\nabla}_p]T^r(x) = -(-1)^{\varepsilon_s(\varepsilon_r+1)}T^s(x)R^r{}_{sqp}(x)$.

Necessary conditions for the quantities $V^{*\mathcal{M}} = 1/\alpha \left[\{\Omega_T,\ \} - (T,\ )^{\mathcal{M}}\right]$, $U^{*\mathcal{M}}$ to be nilpotent, as well as to anticommute with each other and with $\Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$, are the fulfilment of the equations $(D,D)^{\,\mathcal{M}} = 0, \Delta^{\mathcal{M}} D = 0$ for $D \in \{T, T^*\}$, whereas $N^{\mathcal{M}}$ is defined by an adjoint action of $\{\Omega_T, \Omega_T\}$ w.r.t. non-tensor bracket (16),

$$N^{\mathcal{M}} = 1/(2\alpha)\,\{\{\Omega_T, \Omega_T\},\ \} = -1/(2\alpha)\,\{\alpha x^p \omega_{pq} x^q + \eta_p \omega^{pq} \eta_q,\ \} = -(x^p + o(x,\eta))\delta_l/\delta x^p - \eta_p \delta_l/\delta\eta_p. \quad (19)$$

We next define mutually anticommuting nilpotent operators $\mathcal{V}^*$ and $\mathcal{U}^*$ whose difference coincides with $-V^{*\mathcal{M}}$,

$$(\mathcal{V}^*, \mathcal{U}^*) = (1/2)\left(\left[(1/\alpha)\left((T,\ )^{\mathcal{M}} - \{\Omega_T,\ \}\right) - (T^*,\ )^{\mathcal{M}}\right], \left[(1/\alpha)\left(\{\Omega_T,\ \} - (T,\ )^{\mathcal{M}}\right) - (T^*,\ )^{\mathcal{M}}\right]\right). \quad (20)$$

Note that decomposition (20) and the equations for T, T^* impose a number of restrictions on the choice of $(g_{pq},\ \omega^{pq})(x)$ and reduce, by virtue of (18), the quantities $\mathcal{V}^*, \mathcal{U}^*$ to a simpler representation. In the particular case of Darboux coordinates, also assuming the structure $g_{pq}(x)$ and the vanishing of the connection $\Gamma^p{}_{rs}(x)$ on $\mathcal{M}_0$,

$$(x^p, \eta_p, [\omega^{pq}, g_{pq}](x), \Gamma^p{}_{rs}(x), \rho(x)) = \left((\phi^A, \lambda^*_A), (\phi^*_A, \lambda^A), \mathrm{antidiag}\left[\left(-\delta^A_B, \delta^A_B\right), \left(\delta^A_B, \delta^A_B\right)\right], 0, 1\right), \quad (21)$$

we obtain the correspondence $\left(V^{\mathcal{M}}, \mathcal{V}^*, \mathcal{U}^*, \Delta^{\mathcal{M}}\right) = \left(U^k - V^k, V^*_k, U^*_k, \Delta^k + (-1)^{\varepsilon_A + 1} \frac{\delta_l}{\delta\lambda^A} \frac{\delta_l}{\delta\lambda^*_A}\right)$.

4. Quantization rules Let us define the vacuum functional and the generating functional of Green's functions in general coordinates $z^P = (x^p, \eta_p)$,

$$Z^{\mathcal{M}}_X = \int d\tilde{z} \mathcal{D}_0(\tilde{x}) q^{\mathcal{M}}(\tilde{z}) \exp\left\{\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}(W + X) - H\right](\tilde{z}, \hbar)\right\}, \quad (22)$$

$$Z^{\mathcal{M}}\left[J_{\mathcal{V}}, J^{\mathcal{V}^*}, \eta\right] = \int d\tilde{z} \mathcal{D}_0(\tilde{x}) q^{\mathcal{M}}(\tilde{z}) \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[W(\tilde{z}, \hbar) + [X + i\hbar H](\tilde{x}, \tilde{\eta} - \eta, \hbar) + J^p_{\mathcal{V}} \tilde{\eta}_p + J^{\mathcal{V}^*}_p \tilde{x}^p\right]\right\}, \quad (23)$$

where $J^{\mathcal{V}^*}_p, J^p_{\mathcal{V}}$ form a redundant set of sources to the corresponding variables x^p, η_p with the properties $(\varepsilon, \mathrm{gh}) J^{\mathcal{V}^*}_p = (\varepsilon_p, -\mathrm{gh}(x^p)) = (\varepsilon, -\mathrm{gh}) J^p_{\mathcal{V}} + (1, -1)$; H, W, X stand for bosonic functionals providing the correct reduction, e.g., of $Z^{\mathcal{M}}_X$ to the BV partition function [1], as well as the respective quantum action and gauge-fixing bosonic action corresponding to irreducible hypergauges $G_a(z)$, satisfying the generalized master equations and an additional equation for W,

$$\Delta^{\mathcal{M}} \exp\left[(i/\hbar)\, E(z, \hbar)\right] = 0,\ E \in \{W, X + i\hbar H\},\ \mathcal{V} W(z, \hbar) = 0, \quad (24)$$

for the first of which only X is a proper solution in $\mathcal{M}$, while $W(z, \hbar)$ is subject to a boundary condition, $W(z, \hbar)_{\eta = \hbar = 0} = \mathcal{S}_0(x)$, with the classical action $\mathcal{S}_0$, and to the equation $\mathcal{U}^* W(z, \hbar) = 0$ for a non-Fedosov (merely symplectic) $\mathcal{M}_0$. At the same time, the density function $\mathcal{D}_0(x)$ which determines the invariant measure on $\mathcal{M}$ (corresponding for $\alpha = 1$ to the even bracket (16) so that the functional ρ (14) can be defined as $\rho = \ln\ \mathrm{sdet}^{-1}\|\omega^{pq}(x)\|$ as in [26]) and the weight functional $q^{\mathcal{M}}[z]$ are given by

$$\mathcal{D}_0(x) = \mathrm{sdet}^{-1}\|\omega^{pq}(x)\|,\ q^{\mathcal{M}}(z) = \delta\left(G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1}(z)\right),\ a_1 = 1, \ldots, 1/2\left(\dim_+ \mathcal{M}_0 + \dim_- \mathcal{M}_0\right). \quad (25)$$

In (23), (25), in accordance with the decomposition of the operator $V^{*\mathcal{M}}$ in (20), we have used the polarization of $V^{\mathcal{M}}$ into a corresponding difference of operators,

$$V^{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{U} - \mathcal{V} : (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U}) = \frac{1}{2}\eta_p \left(\omega^{pq} + \omega^{ps} g_{st} \omega^{tq} (-1)^{\varepsilon_s}, -\omega^{pq} + \omega^{ps} g_{st} \omega^{tq} (-1)^{\varepsilon_s}\right) \overrightarrow{\nabla}^{\mathcal{M}}_q, \quad (26)$$

with nilpotent anticommuting $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U}$. In turn, the independent functions $G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1}(z){=}0$ playing, in fact, the role of *second-level hypergauge conditions* within the formalism [6], are required to retain the explicit covariant form of both functionals $Z^{\mathcal{M}}_X, Z^{\mathcal{M}}$. The independent functions $G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1}(z)$ are equivalent to an (explicitly given only in the case of symplectic $\mathcal{M}_0$) set of functions $\mathcal{V}^* \eta_p$, $G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1}(z) = \left[Y^p_{a_1}(z) \mathcal{V}^* \eta_p\right]$ with certain $Y^p_{a_1}(z)$ so that

$$\mathrm{rank}\left\|\overrightarrow{\nabla}^{\mathcal{M}}_p E_{\mathrm{t}}(z)\right\|_{\overrightarrow{\nabla}^{\mathcal{M}} W = \delta W/\delta\eta = \overrightarrow{\nabla}^{\mathcal{M}} X = \delta X/\delta\eta = G^{\mathcal{V}^*} = 0} = \frac{1}{2}\dim \mathcal{M}_0,\ (E_1, E_2) = (G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1}, \mathcal{V}^* \eta_p), \quad (27)$$

and define the functional $H(z,\hbar)$ in (22)–(24) in the explicitly covariant form

$$H(z,\hbar)=-\frac{1}{2}\ln\left\{J(z)\mathcal{D}_0^{-1}(x)\mathrm{sdet}M\right\},\ \ M=\left\|\begin{array}{cc}\left(F^{\mathcal{U}^*}_{a_1}(z),G^{c_1}_{\mathcal{V}}(z)\right)^{\mathcal{M}} & \left(F^{\mathcal{U}^*}_{a_1}(z),F^{d_1}_{\mathcal{U}}(z)\right)^{\mathcal{M}}\\ \left(G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{b_1}(z),G^{c_1}_{\mathcal{V}}(z)\right)^{\mathcal{M}} & \left(G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{b_1}(z),F^{d_1}_{\mathcal{U}}(z)\right)^{\mathcal{M}}\end{array}\right\|, \qquad (28)$$

where the functions $(F^{a_1}_{\mathcal{U}}, F^{\mathcal{U}^*}_{b_1}, G^{c_1}_{\mathcal{V}})=(\widetilde{Z}^{a_1}_p\mathcal{U}x^p, Z^p_{b_1}\mathcal{U}^*\eta_p, \widetilde{Y}^{c_1}_p\mathcal{V}x^p)$ with certain $(\widetilde{Z}^{a_1}_p, Z^p_{b_1}, \widetilde{Y}^{c_1}_p)(z)$ determine an invertible change of variables, $z^P\to\overline{z}^P=(F^{\mathcal{U}^*}_{a_1}, G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{b_1}, G^{c_1}_{\mathcal{V}}, F^{d_1}_{\mathcal{U}})$, with the Jacobian J=sdet $\left\|\delta\overline{z}^Q/\delta z^P\right\|$.

The basic properties of the functionals $Z^{\mathcal{M}}_X$, $Z^{\mathcal{M}}$ are encoded by the *generalized generator* $s^{\mathcal{M}}$ of *BRST-like transformations* with an arbitrary bosonic functional $R^{\mathcal{M}}(z)$,

$$s^{\mathcal{M}}=(\hbar/i)\,T^{-1}(z)\left(\ \ ,T(z)R^{\mathcal{M}}(z)\right)^{\mathcal{M}},\ T(z)=\exp\left[(i/\hbar)\left(W-X-i\hbar H\right)(z)\right]. \qquad (29)$$

For instance, the BRST transformations for a constant μ, $\delta_\mu z^P=s^{\mathcal{M}}z^P\mu$, with $Z^{\mathcal{M}}_X$ and $Z^{\mathcal{M}}\,[0,0,\eta]$, are derived from (29), with $R^{\mathcal{M}}$=1, and from additional equations that ensure the BRST invariance of $q^{\mathcal{M}}$,

$$\left(G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1}(z),T(z)\right)^{\mathcal{M}}=0\Longleftrightarrow\delta_\mu G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1}(z)=0. \qquad (30)$$

Thus, the constant (covariantly constant for a flat Fedosov $\mathcal{M}_0$) functions $Y^p_{a_1}(x)$ belong to solutions of eqs. (30) imposing strong restrictions on the geometry of $\mathcal{M}$.

The derivation of the Ward identity for the functional $Z^{\mathcal{M}}$ and the proof of gauge-independence of the S-matrix are based on the master equations (24), on transformation (29), as well as on additional equations for $G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1}(z)$ (30) in a manner described in [11, 12]. Transformation (29) in $Z^{\mathcal{M}}_{X+\delta X}$ with the choice of $R^{\mathcal{M}}$ as $R^{\mathcal{M}}\mu$=$\delta Y(z)$, where the fermionic functional $\delta Y(z)$ is found from the equality $\delta X(z)=Q(X,H)\delta Y(z)$ [with a nilpotent $Q(X,H)$, $Q(X,H)=(X+i\hbar H,\ \ )^{\mathcal{M}}-i\hbar\Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$] being the general non-vanishing solution for the linearized equation $Q(X,H)\delta X(z)$=0, establishes that $Z^{\mathcal{M}}_{X+\delta X}$=$Z^{\mathcal{M}}_X$. In turn, after exponentiating the functional $q^{\mathcal{M}}$ in the functional integral (23), $q^{\mathcal{M}}(\tilde{z})$ =$\int d\tilde{\lambda}_{(2)}\exp\left\{(i/\hbar)G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1}(\tilde{z})\tilde{\lambda}^{a_1}_{(2)}\right\}$, $\varepsilon(\tilde{\lambda}^{a_1}_{(2)})$=$\varepsilon(G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1})$=$\varepsilon_{a_1}$, the corresponding Ward identity has the form

$$\left[J^{\mathcal{V}^*}_p+\left(\frac{\delta_r W}{\delta\tilde{x}^p}+(-1)^{\varepsilon_{a_1}}\langle\tilde{\lambda}^{a_1}_{(2)}\rangle\frac{\delta_r G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1}}{\delta\tilde{x}^p}\right)\left(\frac{\hbar}{i}\frac{\delta_l}{\delta J^{\mathcal{V}^*}},\frac{\hbar}{i}\frac{\delta_l}{\delta J_{\mathcal{V}}}\right)\right]\frac{\delta_l}{\delta\eta_p}Z^{\mathcal{M}}\left[J_{\mathcal{V}},J^{\mathcal{V}^*},\eta\right]=0. \qquad (31)$$

To obtain eq.(31), we start from the functional averaging of the master equation (24) for $(X+i\hbar H)(\tilde{x},\tilde{\eta}-\eta)$ w.r.t. the weight functional, $\exp\left\{(i/\hbar)\left[W(\tilde{z})+G^{\mathcal{V}^*}_{a_1}(\tilde{z})\tilde{\lambda}^{a_1}_{(2)}+J^p_{\mathcal{V}}\tilde{\eta}_p+J^{\mathcal{V}^*}_p\tilde{x}^p\right]\right\}$, and then, using the non-tensor character of x^p, integrate by parts with allowance for $(\delta_l/\delta\tilde{\eta}_p+\delta_l/\delta\eta_p)(X+i\hbar H)=0$. The sign $\langle F(\tilde{z},\tilde{\lambda}_{(2)})\rangle$ here denotes the functional averaging of a quantity $F(\tilde{z},\tilde{\lambda}_{(2)})$ with respect to $Z^{\mathcal{M}}$.

Having chosen Darboux coordinates for z^P along with conditions (21) supplemented by the relations $\left(Z^p_{a_1},Y^p_{a_1},\widetilde{Z}^{a_1}_p,\widetilde{Y}^{a_1}_p\right)=\left(\delta^{Ap},\delta^p_A,\delta^A_p,\delta_{Ap}\right)$ for which the sources can be written as $\left(J^p_{\mathcal{V}};J^{\mathcal{V}^*}_p\right)=\left(-I^{*A},I_A;J_A,J^{*A}\right)$ and $(\mathcal{D}_0,H)=(1,0)$, we obtain the coincidence between the independent of J^{*A} functional $Z^{\mathcal{M}}[I_A,I^{*A},J_A,\phi^*,\lambda]$ for $\lambda^A=0$, and the generating functional of Green's functions $\mathcal{Z}(\theta)_{|\theta=0}$ of the superfield quantization [12] with the obvious designations $(\phi^A,\phi^*_A,\lambda^A)=(\varphi^a,\varphi^*_a,\lambda^a)$.

Concluding, note that the suggested quantization procedure allows one to introduce an effective action and can be developed for the case of reducible hypergauges [11] and the multilevel formalism. Besides, it hides a possibility to establish an explicit correspondence between the BRST and BRSTantiBRST quantizations within the $N=2$ superfield formalism.

Acknowledgments The author is grateful to P.M. Lavrov and P.Yu. Moshin for useful discussions.

References

[1] I.A. Batalin and G.A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. **B102** (1981) 27; Phys. Rev. **D28** (1983) 2567; J. Math. Phys. **26** (1985) 172.

[2] I.A. Batalin, P.M. Lavrov and I.V. Tyutin, J. Math. Phys. **31** (1990) 1487; ibid. **32** (1991) 532; ibid. **32** (1991) 2513;
C.M.Hull, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A5** (1990) 1871.

[3] E.S. Fradkin and G.A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. **B55** (1975) 224; I.A. Batalin and G.A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. **B69** (1977) 309; E.S. Fradkin and T.E. Fradkina, Phys. Lett. **B72** (1978) 343; I.A. Batalin and E.S. Fradkin, Phys. Lett. **B122** (1983) 157;
For a review see: M. Henneaux, Phys. Rept. **126** (1985) 1.

[4] I.A. Batalin, P.M. Lavrov and I.V. Tyutin, J. Math. Phys. **31** (1990) 6; ibid. **31** (1990) 2708; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A6** (1991) 3599.

[5] M. Henneaux, Phys. Lett. **B282** (1992) 372; P. Grigoire and M. Henneaux, Phys. Lett. **B277** (1992) 459; Comm. Math. Phys. **157** (1993) 279.

[6] I.A. Batalin and I.V. Tyutin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A8** (1993) 2333; Mod. Phys. Lett. **A8** (1993) 3673; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A9** (1994) 1707.

[7] I.A. Batalin and I.V. Tyutin, Nucl. Phys. **B345**(1990) 645.

[8] I.A. Batalin and R. Marnelius, Phys. Lett. **B350** (1995) 44; Nucl. Phys. **B465** (1996) 521;
I.A. Batalin, R. Marnelius and A.M. Semikhatov, Nucl. Phys. **B446** (1995) 249.

[9] B. Geyer, D.M. Gitman and P.M. Lavrov, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A14** (1999) 661; Theor. Math. Phys. **123** (2000) 813.

[10] A.A. Reshetnyak, *Basic features of general superfield quantization method for gauge theories in Lagrangian formalism*, Proceedings of the International Seminar on Supersymmetries and Quantum Symmetries SQS 03, Dubna, Russia, July 24–29, 2003 (Eds. E. Ivanov and A. Pashnev, JINR, Dubna, 2004, 345); hep-th/0312118.

[11] A.A. Reshetnyak, Russ. Phys. J. **47** (2004) 1026.

[12] D.M. Gitman, P.Yu. Moshin and A.A. Reshetnyak, J. Math. Phys. **46** (2005) 072302; Phys. Lett. **B621** (2005) 295.

[13] P.M. Lavrov, P.Yu. Moshin and A.A. Reshetnyak, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A10** (1995) 2687; JETP Lett. **62** (1995) 780; B. Geyer, P.M. Lavrov and P.Yu. Moshin, Phys. Lett. **B463** (1999) 188.

[14] I.A. Batalin, K. Bering, P.H.Damgaard, Nucl. Phys. **B515** (1998) 455; Phys. Lett. **B446** (1999) 175.

[15] M. Grigoriev and P.H. Damgaard, Phys. Lett. **B474** (2000) 323.

[16] I.A. Batalin and P.H. Damgaard, Phys. Lett. **B578** (2004) 223; I.A. Batalin and K. Bering, Nucl. Phys. **B700** (2004) 439.

[17] M. Kontsevich, Lett. Math. Phys. **66** (2003) 157, q-alg/9709040.

[18] A.S. Cattaneo and G. Felder, Comm. Math. Phys. **212** (2000) 591; Mod. Phys. Lett. **A16** (2001) 179; Lett. Math. Phys. **56** (2001) 163.

[19] M. Alexandrov, M. Kontsevich, A. Schwarz and O. Zaboronsky, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A12** (1997) 1405.

[20] M.A. Grigoriev and S.L. Lyakchovich, Comm. Math. Phys. **218** (2001) 437; I.A. Batalin, M.A. Grigoriev and S.L. Lyakchovich, Theor. Math. Phys. **128** (2001) 1109; J.Math.Phys. **46** (2005) 072301.

[21] L.D. Faddeev and S.L. Shatashvili, Phys. Lett. **B167** (1986) 225;
I.A. Batalin and E.S. Fradkin, Phys. Lett. **B180** (1987) 156; Nucl. Phys. **B279** (1987) 514; I.A. Batalin and I.V. Tyutin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A6** (1991) 3255.

[22] S.L. Lyakhovich and A.A. Sharapov, JHEP **03** (2005) 011; P.O. Kazinski, S.L. Lyakhovich and A.A. Sharapov, JHEP **07** (2005) 076.

[23] M.A. Vasiliev, Phys. Lett. **B243** (1990) 378; *ibid.* **B285** (1992) 225; *ibid.* **B567** (2003) 139; Fortsch. Phys. **52** (2004) 702.

[24] B.V. Fedosov, J. Diff. Geom. **40** (1994) 369; *Deformation Quantization and Index Theory* (Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1996);

[25] I. Gelfand, V. Retakh and M. Shubin, Advan. Math. **136** (1998) 104; dg-ga/9707024.

[26] B. Geyer, P. Lavrov and A. Nersessian, Phys. Lett. **B512** (2001) 211; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A17** (2002) 1183; B. Geyer and P.M. Lavrov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A19** (2004) 1639.

[27] B. Geyer, D.M. Gitman, P.M. Lavrov and P.Yu. Moshin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A19** (2004) 737.

[28] P.Yu. Moshin and A.A. Reshetnyak, *in preparation.*

[29] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems* (Princeton U.P., NJ 1992); J.M.L. Fisch and M. Henneaux, Comm. Math. Phys. **128** (1990) 627.

[30] B. Geyer and P. Lavrov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A19** (2004) 3195; *ibid.* **A20** (2005).